

RECRUITING CERTIFIED PERSONNEL TO BE PRINCIPALS: A STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL JOB APPLICANTS

An essential administrative responsibility accorded to state- and district-level education leaders is the task of planning for staffing needs, including the recruitment of competent leaders to fill principal vacancies (Castetter & Young, 2000; Rebore, 2001). This task is becoming increasingly difficult to perform. Recent education recruitment studies (Bowles, King, & Crow, 2000; Education Research Service, 1998; Fenwick, 2000; National Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals, 1998; Whitaker, 2001) indicate there is a growing national shortage of qualified applicants for principal vacancies. One factor contributing to this shortage is the massive retirement of school administrators from the post-World War II “baby boom” generation (National Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals, 1998). While school administrator employment will increase by 20% by the year 2008, the U.S. Department of Labor estimates that 40% of the nation’s principals are nearing retirement (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000).

The applicant shortage noted above does not exist because there are insufficient numbers of principal certified personnel available to apply for position vacancies. To the contrary, there are adequate numbers of individuals who are principal certified and are nominally qualified to assume principal positions. However, a majority of certified personnel are not applying for principal vacancies, in part, because they are not attracted to the job (McAdams, 1998). The decreased attractiveness of the principalship is due to (a) the enormous responsibilities accorded to public school principals in today’s educational environment emphasizing school reform and (b) the increased principal accountability for improving student achievement (Duke, 1998; Murphy & Beck, 1994; Portin, Shen, & Williams, 1998).

The site for this study was Kentucky, a state undergoing systemic school reform via programs that include high-stakes student achievement tests, with school principals being the most visible individuals held accountable for student performance (Petrosko, 2000). A statewide K-12 leadership consortium, led by the Kentucky Department of Education, commissioned the researchers to conduct this study to access reliable data to support planning and policy decisions related to administrator recruitment and development.

Purpose

The research objectives were to: (a) construct a statewide profile of principal certified personnel characteristics and activity relative to interviewing

for principal jobs and receiving job offers; (b) measure the participants' degree of attraction to principal positions; (c) measure the participants' level of satisfaction with characteristics of their current jobs compared to their expected satisfaction with those same job characteristics if they were to assume a position as principal; (d) identify reasons why the participants earned principal certification; (e) capture the participants' ratings of changes in the job of principal that might make the job more attractive; and (f) have the state's principal certified personnel rate barriers to assuming a job as principal. Accomplishing the above objectives resulted in developing empirical measures to allow state departments of education and school districts to assess their principal certified personnel in terms of recruitment planning and developing policies to restructure the principalship.

Methods

This study was a causal-comparative study involving the use of a survey questionnaire to collect the data. Descriptive statistics served to profile the study participants and their job pursuit activity in terms of interviewing for principal vacancies and receiving job offers. The inferential statistical analysis included paired *t*-tests, one-way analysis of variance, and ordinary least-squares stepwise multiple regression.

Participants

The participants were 466 principal certified personnel not currently employed as principals from all 176 school districts in Kentucky. The participants took part in the research by completing a survey questionnaire and reviewing and rating a principal job described in a formal job description at the end of the survey instrument. The response rate to the survey was 41%. Follow-up analyses (e.g., chi-square analysis) indicated the distribution of the study sample did not differ significantly from the statewide population of principal certified personnel with respect to demographic characteristics (e.g., gender and ethnicity).

Instrument and Variable Measures

The questionnaire (see Appendix) had the following sections: (a) background information about the participants; (b) current and expected job satisfaction scales measuring the participants' satisfaction with 20 job facets in their current jobs and their expected satisfaction with these same job facets if they were to assume a principal position; (c) reasons for earning principal

certification; (d) changes in the job of principal that might make the job more attractive and inform policy makers relative to job restructuring; (e) barriers to pursuing the job of principal; and (f) a formal principal job description followed by two rating items.

The participants responded to the current and expected job satisfaction items using 5-point Likert-type scales (1 = not at all satisfied, 5 = extremely satisfied). The scales for reasons for earning principal certification assessed degree of importance (1 = not at all important, 5 = extremely important). The items for changes in the job of principal assessed likelihood the change would make the job more attractive (1 = not at all likely, 5 = extremely likely). The participants evaluated barriers to pursuing the job of principal in terms of their agreement or disagreement that a factor was a barrier (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The above scales were adopted from previous research that rendered reliable measures (Aiken, 1996; Gable & Wolf, 1993).

The two rating items following the principal job description at the end of the survey were adopted from previous educational recruitment studies (Young, Rinehart, & Place, 1989; Young, Rinehart, & Heneman, 1993) and summed to form a composite score for the dependent variable (participant rating of a principal job). The two rating items were: (a) "If offered, how likely would you be to accept an interview for the principal job described?" and (b) "If offered, how likely would you be to accept the principal job described?" Coefficient alpha for the composite score was .93.

Data Analysis

The paired *t*-test served to assess group mean differences between participant job facet scores for current job satisfaction and job facet scores for expected job satisfaction as a principal.

The two-item composite score for participant rating of a principal job, described on the principal job description at the end of the survey, was the dependent variable for both the one-way ANOVA and the multiple regression procedures. The independent variable for the ANOVA was current job (assistant principal, other administrative position, teacher, school counselor). The independent variables for the regression were personal characteristics of the participants: age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, number of dependent children, year of principal certification, and self-reported capability to do the job of principal. We measured the year of principal certification on an interval scale with the unit of measure being years. Thus, an individual certified 10 years prior to the study data collection (completed in 2002) received a score of 1992. An individual certified two years prior to the study received a score of 2000.

Because the purpose of the regression procedure was to develop a model with maximum power for predicting participant rating of the job, the researchers used the stepwise method for variable entry (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). The measure for self-reported capability to do the job of principal was: "At this point in your career, how capable do you feel you are to do the job of principal?" (1 = not at all capable, 5 = extremely capable).

Hypotheses

We tested two directional hypotheses in this study. First, we hypothesized that principal certified personnel who earned their certification recently (i.e., within the last five years) would rate a principal job more favorably than would individuals who had earned their principal certification further back in time (i.e., more than five years ago). We assumed individuals who had held principal certification for a relatively long period of time (i.e., more than five years), without pursuing or obtaining a principal position, were unsuccessful in being perceived as viable candidates for the job, or lacked interest in pursuing the position.

Second, we hypothesized that, as principal certified individuals' self-reported capability to do the job increased, their rating of the job of principal would also increase. This hypothesis is consistent with both the research about self-efficacy (Bandura, 1993) and the research about self-esteem (Ellis & Taylor, 1983; Kanfer & Hulin, 1985).

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's perceived capability to successfully execute a course of action (Bandura, 1993). The courses of action relevant to this study were pursuing the job of principal and performing in the role of principal upon assuming the position. With respect to self-esteem, Ellis and Taylor (1983) found that people with high self-esteem applied for more jobs than did individuals with low self-esteem. Kanfer and Hulin (1985) found that self-confidence about pursuing position vacancies was positively related to performing a successful job search. The other sources of variance assessed in this study were tested using null hypotheses stated in the standard form.

Results

Descriptive data for the study participants appear in Table 1. The participants averaged 44.3 years of age and had an average of one dependent child. The participants were distributed evenly across the genders, which reflects the fact that in recent years women have entered principal certification programs in large numbers and frequently equal or exceed the number of

males: “[M]ost administrator preparation programs have long reported as many or more female graduates as male graduates” (Pounder & Merrill, 2001, p. 49). The participants were predominately White (95.7%) and married (85.6%), which closely paralleled the national statistics for these two factors relative to individuals who ultimately become principals (U.S. Department of Education, 2000).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Study Participants (N = 466)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Range
Age			44.3	8.8	24-68
Dependent children			.9	1.0	0-5
Gender					
Female	232	49.8			
Male	234	50.2			
Ethnicity					
White	446	95.7			
Black	15	3.2			
Other	5	1.1			
Marital status					
Married	399	85.6			
Single	68	14.4			
Number of interviews			1.5	2.0	0-12
Assist. Prin.	159	34.1	1.4	1.7	0-10
Teacher	184	39.5	1.5	2.1	0-12
Counselor	18	3.9	1.4	2.3	0-10
Other admin.	105	22.5	1.7	2.2	0-12
Number of job offers			.6	1.1	0-10
Assist. Prin.	159	34.1	.7	.9	0-5
Teacher	184	39.5	.5	1.1	0-8
Counselor	18	3.9	.4	.8	0-2
Other admin.	105	22.5	.7	1.1	0-10

The year the most principals received certification was 1992. Even though these individuals had been certified, on average, for a decade, they averaged less than two interviews for a principal position and less than one job offer. The mode for both interviews and job offers was zero. The median for

interviews was one and the median for job offers was zero. The job pursuit activity of the participants varied little across current jobs held. One might have assumed, for example, that assistant principals, who hold the job that is the traditional stepping stone into the principalship, might have interviewed more for the job and received more job offers than did teachers who lacked administrative experience. As the data in Table 1 demonstrate, this was not the case. From the meager job pursuit activity described above, it appears a majority of the participants either (a) were not actively pursuing a job as principal or (b) were viewed by their district superintendents as not being desirable candidates for the job. We emphasize all participants had the minimum qualifications for the job (i.e., three years teaching experience and principal certification). Also, 56% of the participants had administrative job experience, which would further qualify them for a principal job.

The result of the ANOVA, with current job serving as the independent variable and job rating serving as the dependent variable, was not significant ($F[3, 462] = 1.43, p > .05$). Across all levels of current job held (assistant principal, other administrative position, teacher, school counselor), there were no significant group mean differences in participant rating of a principal job. Further, the group means ranged from 7.07 to 7.71 on a two-item composite scale with a potential range of 2-10, with the midpoint of the scale being 6. One might expect that, if most of the participants intended to aggressively pursue a job as principal, they might have rated the job closer to the high end of the scale.

The significant results of the paired *t*-tests are in Table 2. The participants expected to be less satisfied in the job of principal than in their current jobs relative to six work facets: vacation time, time with family, job security, hours worked per week, hours worked per year, and effect of the job on one's spouse. The participants expected to be more satisfied in the job of principal than in their current jobs relative to 11 work facets: opportunity to use one's talents, salary, extra-service pay, freedom to make decisions, sense of achievement, opportunity to try one's own way of doing things, opportunity for career advancement, opportunity to experience varied activities, opportunity to serve others, impacting the way school policies are implemented, and opportunity to give direction to others.

The results of the multiple regression analysis appear in Table 3. The data in Table 3 indicate there were two significant predictors of participant rating of a principal job: year of principal certification and self-reported capability to do the job. Both predictors correlated positively with principal job rating. As the participants' year of principal certification was more recent, and self-reported capability to do the job increased, participant rating of a principal job increased. The full regression model explained 19.8% of the variance in principal

job rating, an effect size falling between the minimum criteria established by Cohen (1988, pp. 413-414) for a “medium” effect size ($R^2 = .13$) and a “large” effect size ($R^2 = .26$).

Table 2

Paired t-test Results for Current Job Satisfaction Compared to Expected Job Satisfaction in the Job of Principal (N = 466)

Satisfaction item	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i>
Current job satisfaction higher		
Vacation time	11.0	.0001
Time with family	12.1	.0001
Job security	10.0	.0001
Hours worked per week	10.3	.0001
Hours worked per year	8.5	.0001
Effect of job on spouse	7.8	.0001
Expected satisfaction higher		
Opportunity to use talents	-4.1	.0001
Salary	-11.1	.0001
Extra-service pay	-5.1	.0001
Freedom to make decisions	-2.8	.005
Sense of achievement	-4.5	.0001
Opportunity to try one's own way of doing things	-3.9	.0001
Opportunity for career advancement	-7.5	.0001
Opportunity to experience varied activities	-6.0	.0001
Opportunity to serve others	-5.5	.0001
Impacting the way school policies are implemented	-13.4	.0001
Opportunity to give direction to others	-10.7	.0001

Table 3

Stepwise Multiple Regression of Principal Job Rating on Predictor Variables (N = 466)

Predictor variables	ΔR^2	F	p
Year of certification	.134	71.598	.0001
Capability to do the job	.064	36.854	.0001

Note. Full Model: $R^2 = .198$ ($F[2, 463] = 56.993, p < .0001$). Adjusted- $R^2 = .194$. Year of certification was scored on an interval scale as actual year a participant received certification with the unit of measure being years.

With respect to ratings for reasons for earning principal certification, recommended changes in the job of principal, and barriers to pursuing a principal position, the criterion selected for considering an item important was a minimum score of 4 on a 5-point scale. The highest rated reasons for earning principal certification were to: expand career options, improve student learning, become qualified to be a principal, and assume a greater leadership role. The highest rated recommended changes in the job of principal were to: help with principal paperwork, make the school a safe place for students, assign some duties to other personnel, provide more time to supervise teachers, and higher salary. No potential barriers to pursuing a principal job received ratings of 4 on a 5-point scale.

Discussion

Despite the centrality of principal recruitment to school administration and leadership (Castetter & Young, 2000; Rebore, 2001), there is little empirical research about administrator recruitment (Pounder & Young, 1996). The results reported above have implications for both recruitment practice and restructuring the principalship.

Recruitment Practice

One implication for recruitment practice is that school districts cannot assume that the existence of even a large number of principal certified personnel assures there will be adequate pools of qualified applicants for principal

vacancies. The study findings indicate the majority of the participants have (a) been certified for a decade or more without obtaining a principal position and (b) engaged in little job pursuit activity that resulted in job interviews and job offers. Part of the reason for the lack of more aggressive job pursuit may relate to the increased accountability and responsibilities of the principalship in reform states like Kentucky.

Study findings indicate school districts may have to conduct more aggressive external recruitment. The competition for qualified personnel, however, may be intense because of the massive principal retirements starting to occur (Peterson & Kelley, 2001) and the declining number of individuals actively pursuing position vacancies (Fenwick, 2000). School district officials might consider non-traditional job candidates, an organizational recruitment strategy recommended by Rynes and Barber (1990). Such a strategy has, in fact, been implemented in some areas relative to the superintendency. Boards of education have hired non-traditional applicants to be the district superintendent (Jones, 1994). Howard Fuller, the former Director of the Milwaukee County Department of Human Services, became the Superintendent of the Milwaukee public schools. Peter Hutchinson, the former Chief Executive Officer of Public Strategies, Inc., a private consulting firm, was hired as Superintendent of the Minneapolis public schools.

Another implication relates to recruiting more female and minority principals. The study results indicated there are nearly as many women (49.8%) as men (50.2%) in the pool of principal certified personnel examined, a finding consistent with the findings of other researchers (e.g., McAdams, 1998; Pounder & Merrill, 2001). The principal certified pool is dominated by Whites (95.7%) versus minorities (4.3%). The above data are consistent with national data (U.S. Department of Education, 2000): more men (65.5%) than women (34.5%) hold the majority of principal positions despite the growing parity of women graduating from principal preparation programs (Pounder & Merrill, 2001). White men (84.3%) also continue to greatly exceed minorities of all genders (15.7%) in obtaining principal positions (U.S. Department of Education, 2000).

Some researchers assert there is historical bias in favor of White male candidates in the administrator hiring process (Glazer, 1991; Shakeshaft, 1989). Because White men have dominated educational administration for decades, and administration has traditionally been viewed as a masculine role, women and minorities may receive little encouragement and mentoring relative to obtaining administrative positions (Hudson, 1991; Hudson, 1994; Ortiz, 1982; Ortiz, 1995). Women and minorities may be discouraged from even applying for position vacancies, believing they are disadvantaged versus White male applicants. Pounder and Merrill concluded women are a “largely untapped

resource” (2001, p. 49) for filling principal vacancies. The same conclusion may apply to minorities. If racial and gender bias exists, then educational leaders working to eliminate that bias would result in greater numbers of women and minorities applying for principal vacancies and alleviating the current shortage of qualified applicants.

Further implications derive from the multiple regression results. Both year of principal certification and self-reported capability to do the job of principal emerged as significant predictors of participant principal job ratings. These findings signal education leaders and policy makers that individuals not actively pursuing principal vacancies soon after earning principal certification are unlikely to ever be job applicants. The existence of such individuals in a district’s pool of principal certified personnel inflates the pool’s perceived utility as a source of qualified applicants and leads to district officials overestimating their ability to recruit principals internally.

The regression findings also suggest the usefulness of capturing empirical measures of individuals’ perceived capability to do the job. Obtaining such measures at key junctures (e.g., when individuals become principal certified) would provide district officials important data concerning their ability to recruit principals internally. If internal principal certified personnel, in their majority, do not intend to pursue the job or perceive themselves as incapable of doing the job, then implementing more aggressive external recruitment would appear, again, to be essential for acquiring qualified school leaders.

Job Restructuring

Historically, the principalship is a position defined by default rather than by design (Murphy & Beck, 1994). The job evolves haphazardly through the steady accretion of tasks and responsibilities, many of which are legislative mandates created by politicians (Duke, 1998) rather than by education leaders. Whether the job, in its present form, is structured in a rational way is an open question and, during much of the current reform cycle, reformers have concentrated more on changing the applicant pool (Murphy, 1992) than on changing the job. Education reformers increasingly advocate restructuring the principalship to make the job more doable and more attractive to potential job applicants. Suggestions for restructuring include: decreasing district-level mandates, decreasing evening activities, reducing the work week and work year, adding support personnel to assist with paperwork, and assigning some principal duties to other personnel (McAdams, 1998).

Results obtained in this study support recommendations such as those described above. Principal certified personnel expected to be less satisfied in the job of principal relative to vacation time, time with family, hours worked

per week, and hours worked per year. They expected the principalship to have an adverse impact on their spouses and on their job security. The job security issue may be especially important in high-stakes reform states like Kentucky, where principals of schools not performing adequately on standardized achievement tests can be replaced. School districts could address the time factor with “more generous vacation policies” (McAdams, 1998) and by providing more support personnel as mentioned earlier. Job security could be addressed contractually by guaranteeing employment in another position (e.g., teacher, counselor) for a specified period of time if removed from the principalship.

Conclusion

The quality of educational programs depends, in part, on the quality of the individuals hired to be school principals (Castetter & Young, 2000; Rebore, 2001). Obtaining sufficient numbers of qualified applicants for position vacancies is partly contingent on the number of individuals in a school district’s pool of principal certified personnel who are willing and able to apply for open positions. Many school districts may believe, erroneously, they have abundant potential job applicants for principal vacancies when the opposite is true. Hopefully, the findings reported here will stimulate additional empirical research about principal certified personnel and the shrinkage of applicant pools for principal vacancies. Such research would enable education leaders and policy makers to (a) gain in-depth understanding of the shrinking applicant pool phenomenon and (b) recommend appropriate recruitment and job restructuring policies to address a situation that appears to be emerging as a national crisis.

References

- Aiken, L. R. (1996). *Rating scales & checklists: Evaluating behavior, personality, and attitudes*. New York: Wiley.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognition development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28, 117-148.
- Bowles, B., King, D., & Crow, G. (2000, April). *Viable principal candidates: Superintendents’ perspective*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Castetter, W. B., & Young, I. P. (2000). *The human resource function in educational administration* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavior sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Duke, D. L. (1998). Why principals consider quitting. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70, 308-312.
- Educational Research Service. (1998). *Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship? An exploratory study*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Ellis, R. A., & Taylor, M. S. (1983). Role of self-esteem within the job search process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 632-640.
- Fenwick, L. T. (2000). *The principal shortage: Who will lead?* [Monograph]. Cambridge, MA: The Principal's Center, Harvard University.
- Gable, R. K., & Wolf, M. B. (1993). *Instrument development in the affective domain: Measuring attitudes and values in corporate and school settings* (2nd ed.). Boston: Kluwer.
- Glazer, J. S. (1991). Feminism and professionalism in teaching and educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27, 321-342.
- Hudson, M. J. (1991). *How educators get top jobs: Understanding race and sex differences in the old boy network*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Hudson, M. J. (1994). Women and minorities in school administration: Re-examining the role of informal job contact systems. *Urban Education*, 28, 386-398.
- Jones, R. (1994). Instant superintendent: Can a candidate with business savvy but no education experience really handle the job? *The American School Board Journal*, 181(4), 23-26.
- Kanfer, H., & Hulin, C. L. (1985). Individual differences in successful job searches following lay-off. *Personnel Psychology*, 38, 835-847.
- McAdams, R. P. (1998). Who'll run the schools? The coming administrator shortage. *The American School Board Journal*, 29(8), 37-39.
- Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J., & Beck, L. G. (1994). Restructuring the principalship: Challenges and possibilities. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- National Association of Elementary and Secondary Principals. (1998). Over fifty-percent of the principals in America will retire in the next ten years. *Principal*, 70(4), 65.
- Ortiz, F. I. (1982). *Career patterns in education: Women, men and minorities in school administration*. New York: Praeger.

- Ortiz, F. I. (1995). Becoming a school leader: The case of females and minorities. *People & Education*, 3, 83-111.
- Peterson, K., & Kelly, L. (2001). Transforming school leadership. *Leadership*, 30(3), 8-11.
- Petrosko, J. M. (2000). Assessment and accountability. In J. M. Petrosko & J. C. Lindle (Eds.), *2000 Review of Research on the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA)* (pp. 3-81). Lexington, KY: The Kentucky Institute for Education Research.
- Portin, B. S., Shen, J., & Williams, R. C. (1998). The changing principalship and its impact: Voices from principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 82(602), 1-8.
- Pounder, D. G., & Merrill, R. J. (2001). Job desirability of the high school principalship: A job choice theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 27-57.
- Pounder, D. G., & Young, I. P. (1996). Recruitment and selection of educational administrators: Priorities for today's schools. In K. Leithwood (Ed.) & A. W. Hart (Section Ed.), *The international handbook of educational leadership* (pp. 279-308). Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Rebore, R. W. (2001). *Human resources administration in education* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rynes, S. L., & Barber, A. E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 286-310.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration* (Rev. ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- U.S. Department of Education (2000). *Digest of education statistics 2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2000). *Occupational outlook handbook, 2000-01 edition* (Bulletin 2520). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Whitaker, K. S. (2001). Where are the principal candidates? Perceptions of superintendents. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85, 82-92.
- Young, I. P., Rinehart, J. S., & Heneman, H. G. III (1993). Effects of job attribute categories, applicant job experience, and recruiter sex on applicant job attractiveness ratings. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7, 55-66.
- Young, I. P., Rinehart, J. S., & Place, A. W. (1989). Theories for teacher selection: Objective, subjective, and critical contact. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5, 329-336.

Paul A. Winter is an Associate Professor in the Department of Leadership, Foundations, & Human Resource Education at the University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.

James S. Rinehart is a Professor in and Chair of the Department of Administration & Supervision at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

John L. Keedy is a Professor in the Department of Leadership, Foundations, & Human Resource Education at the University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.

Lars G. Björk is an Associate Professor in the Department of Administration & Supervision at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

Appendix

PRINCIPAL CERTIFICATION SURVEY

(a) Background Information

INSTRUCTIONS: Please enter the information requested below that applies to you best. All information provided is anonymous and confidential. Please do not write your name on this survey.

Demographics

Age (Years): ____

Gender (check one): ____ Female ____ Male

Ethnicity (check one): ____ African American ____ Asian American
 ____ White American ____ Native American
 ____ Hispanic American
 ____ Other (Please specify) _____)

Marital Status (check one): ____ Married ____ Single

Number of Dependent Children ____

Educational Level (Please check all degrees that apply)

____ Bachelor's ____ Master's ____ Specialist ____ Doctorate

Work Experience as an Educator

My current job title is (check one): ____ Teacher ____ School Counselor
 ____ Other (Please specify _____)

In what year did you earn your administrator (principal) certification?
(Year: _____)

At this point in your career, how capable do you feel you are to become a principal? Circle the one number on the scale below that applies best.

**Not at All
Capable**

**Extremely
Capable**

1

2

3

4

5

(b) Current and Expected Job Satisfaction

INSTRUCTIONS: There are two sets of rating scales for the job characteristics described below. The scales range from a low of 1 (Not at All Satisfied) to a high of 5 (Extremely Satisfied). The scales to the left relate to your satisfaction with your current job. The scales to the right relate to your expected job satisfaction if you were to assume a position as principal. Please circle the one number for each scale that reflects your opinion best regarding current and expected job satisfaction.

<u>CURRENT JOB SATISFACTION</u>					<u>EXPECTED PRINCIPAL JOB SATISFACTION</u>					
In my current job, I rate my satisfaction with the below job characteristics as . . .					If I were a principal, I would expect to rate my satisfaction with the below job characteristics as . . .					
<u>Job Characteristics</u>	Not at All Satisfied			Extremely Satisfied	Not at All Satisfied			Extremely Satisfied		
1. The opportunity to use my talents	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. My salary	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. The work climate	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. The freedom to make my own decisions	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5. The sense of achievement I experience on the job	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. The opportunity to try my own way of doing things . . .	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. The vacation time I have	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. Income I receive from extra-service pay	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. The time I have to spend with my family	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

CURRENT JOB SATISFACTION			EXPECTED PRINCIPAL JOB SATISFACTION		
In my current job, I rate my satisfaction with the below job characteristics as . . .			If I were a principal, I would expect to rate my satisfaction with the below job characteristics as . . .		
Job Characteristics	Not at All Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Not at All Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	
10. Extra income I can earn in the summer	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
11. My overall job security	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
12. The hours I work per week	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
13. The opportunity to advance in my career	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
14. The hours I work per year	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
15. The effect my job has on my spouse's career	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
16. The opportunity to experience varied activities on the job	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
17. The opportunity to serve others	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
18. The way school policies are implemented	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
19. The opportunity to give direction to others	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	
20. The recognition I receive for doing a good job	1	2 3 4 5	1	2 3 4 5	

(c) **Reasons for Earning Principal Certification**

INSTRUCTIONS: Reasons for earning principal certification are listed below with scales ranging from left to right and from a low of 1 (Not at All Important) to a high of 5 (Extremely Important). To what extent were the reasons below important in your decision to earn principal certification? Please circle the one number on each scale that reflects your opinion best.

<u>I Earned Principal Certification to:</u>	Not at All Important				Extremely Important
Become qualified to be an assistant principal.	1	2	3	4	5
Increase my salary.	1	2	3	4	5
Become qualified to be a building principal.	1	2	3	4	5
Expand my career options.	1	2	3	4	5
Pursue professional development.	1	2	3	4	5
Assume a greater leadership role in my district.	1	2	3	4	5
Improve my job status.	1	2	3	4	5
Make innovations in education.	1	2	3	4	5

Interviews and Job Offers for Administrator Positions

How many times have you **interviewed** for a position as principal? _____

How many times have you **received a job offer** for a position as **principal**? _____

(d) Changing the Job of Principal

INSTRUCTIONS: Some policy makers believe changing some aspects of the job of principal would make the position more attractive to potential job applicants. Changes in the job of principal are listed below with scales ranging from left to right and from a low of 1 (Not at All Likely) to a high of 5 (Very Likely). From your knowledge of the job, are the changes described below likely to influence you to pursue a job as principal? Please circle the one number that applies best.

<u>Principal Job Changes</u>	Not at all Likely	Very Likely
1. Higher principal salary?	1 2 3 4 5	
2. Help with principal paperwork?	1 2 3 4 5	
3. Better principal retirement benefits?	1 2 3 4 5	
4. Assignment of some principal duties (e.g., records, budget, extra-curricular activities) to other personnel?	1 2 3 4 5	
5. More principal vacation days?	1 2 3 4 5	
6. Increased job authority/responsibility for principals?	1 2 3 4 5	

(e) Barriers to Becoming a Principal

INSTRUCTIONS: Possible barriers to becoming a principal are listed below with scales ranging from left to right and from a low of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to a high of 5 (Strongly Agree). To what extent do you disagree or agree that the barriers listed below would make it unlikely that you would pursue a job as principal. Please circle the one number that reflects your opinion best.

I would be <u>unlikely</u> to pursue the the job of principal because . . .	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
1. I am required to move to another school district.	1	5
2. My work year becomes longer.	1	5
3. I would be the primary person responsible for the efforts related to KERA.	1	5
4. My spouse must change jobs.	1	5
5. The hours per week I work increase.	1	5
6. The extent of my job duties increases.	1	5
7. The degree I am held accountable for student achievement increases.	1	5
8. The hours per day I work increase.	1	5
9. Becoming a principal requires me to make a career change.	1	5
10. I am satisfied with my current job.	1	5
11. I would have to deal with the issues surrounding school councils.	1	5
12. I have decided I do not want to be a principal.	1	5

I would be <u>unlikely</u> to pursue the the job of principal because ...	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
13. The principal application/selection process (that includes school councils) is too burdensome.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Being a principal would cause me to lose touch with students.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I would have inadequate authority given the high-stakes accountability demanded of me.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I could be assigned to a school with a high percentage of at-risk students.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I might be assigned to a school that is below its threshold for CATS scores.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I would first have to be an assistant principal primarily assigned to student discipline.	1	2	3	4	5
19. The baggage I carry with school council members at my current school would force me to change schools to become a principal.	1	2	3	4	5

(f) Rating a Principal Job Description

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read the following job description for a principal position and rate the job using the two job evaluation items provided. Check the one number on each rating scale that applies best.

JOB DESCRIPTION - SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Assumes responsibility for planning, implementing, supervising, and maintaining the educational program to achieve the district’s educational goals. The scope is determined by school size, student characteristics, programs mandated by student needs, and community expectations.

THE PRINCIPAL IS THE SCHOOL LEADER FOR...

- | | |
|--|--|
| - Curriculum/instruction to meet student needs | - Multi-cultural, gender, and racial diversity |
| - Personnel supervision and evaluation | - Supervising extra-curricular programs |
| - School council decision-making | - Equipment and facilities management |
| - Public and school-community relations | - Regulations and accreditation standards |
| - Fiscal records/accounting practices | - Parent organization/school program interface |

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

1. Master’s degree in education
2. Eligible to begin Kentucky Principal Internship Program (KPIP)
3. Three years teaching experience (As defined in KRS 161.220 and KRS 161.720)

DESIRABLE QUALIFICATIONS

1. Rank I with Kentucky Administrator (Principal) Certification in administration and Supervision
2. Experience with/working knowledge of current school programs and procedures
3. Demonstrated ability to work with groups from diversified backgrounds

JOB EVALUATION

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview** for the principal job described?

Very <u>Unlikely To</u> Accept					Very Likely To Accept
1	2	3	4		5

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept the principal job** described?

Very <u>Unlikely To</u> Accept					Very Likely To Accept
1	2	3	4		5